



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/894,879	06/29/2001	Paul Glatkowski	38572.0024	4705
28694	7590	06/20/2006	EXAMINER	
NOVAK DRUCE & QUIGG, LLP 1300 EYE STREET NW 400 EAST TOWER WASHINGTON, DC 20005			YOON, TAE H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1714	

DATE MAILED: 06/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/894,879	GLATKOWSKI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tae H. Yoon	1714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 23-49,52-54 and 76-122 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 23-49,52-54 and 76-122 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 23-49, 52-54 and 76-122 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

This is NEW MATTER rejection since newly recited "an enhancement of at least 5 dB" does not have support in the originally filed specification contrary to applicant assertion since said "at least 5 dB" encompasses 5 dB. Applicant points to page 9 and table 1 for support, but the table 1 shows an enhancement of 11 dB in 20 KHz and 0.4 MHz, for example. Also, the recited enhancement of at least 10 dB, at least 20 dB, at least 50 dB, at least 100 dB and at least 150 dB does not have support either.

Also, the limitation recited claim 42 does not have support at page 13 wherein the recited combined limitation, "carbon nanotubes that are substantially not in contact with each other, other than their longitudinal areas" and "are not aligned or oriented to provide electromagnetic shielding" cannot be found in page 9 and table 1 as well as page 13. Applicant failed to point out a particular support by stating only page 9 and table 1.

Claims 23-49, 52-54 and 76-103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the composite of PET and nanotubes having an enhanced electromagnetic shielding, does not reasonably provide enablement for the recited composite. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Note that claims recite "an enhancement of at least 5 dB" based on page 9 and table 1 and the teaching on page 9 and table 1 is directed to a composite of PET and nanotubes only. But, the recited composite and various polymers of claims are broader than the actual invention to support said an enhancement of at least 5 dB. There is no showing for an enhancement of at least 5 dB for polymers other than PET.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Art Unit: 1714

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 23-49, 52-54 and 76-122 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-14 of U.S. Patent No. 6,265,466. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the composite of said patent inherently meets the instant enhancement of at least 5 dB as evidenced by table 1 and since the aspect ratio of at least 100:1 in claim 14 of said patent encompasses the instant 500:1 and 1,000:1. Other recited properties are inherent or taught at the specification of said patent.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 23-49, 52-54, 76-103, 104 and 108-122 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Smalley et al (US 6,683,783).

Rejection is maintained for reason of record with following response.

The recited enhancement of the recited dB is an inherent property of the article taught by Smalley et al. Note that any material, especially a solid material, has the electromagnetic shielding property inherently.

Applicant asserts that having carbon nanotube aligned and oriented in a direction perpendicular to an electric field does not mean that the carbon nanotubes possess electromagnetic shielding properties. However, it is applicant's opinion and applicant failed to show such assertion (the article of Smalley et al does not have the instantly recited shielding effectiveness). Applicant failed show that the article of Smalley et al does not have the instantly recited enhancement of the recited dB. The components (matrix and carbon nanotube having an aspect ratio, alignment and orientation) in the article of Smalley et al meets the instant composite, and thus the property would have been inherently same.

Claims 23-49, 52-54 and 76-122 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Smalley et al (US 6,683,783) and Shibuta et al (US 5,908,585).

The instant invention further recites an aspect ratio of at least 1000:1 over 769:1 of Smalley et al. However, Smalley et al teach various diameters and lengths of carbon nanotubes at col. 6, lines 60-65 encompassing said 1000:1

Art Unit: 1714

Shibuta et al teach that the use of carbon nanotubes in shielding electromagnetic waves is well known in the art at col. 2, lines 1-14, and such teaching supports the examiner's position in above.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to utilize carbon nanotubes an aspect ratio of at least 1000:1 in Smalley et al since Smalley et al teach various diameters and lengths of carbon nanotubes, and Shibuta et al teach that the use of carbon nanotubes in shielding electromagnetic waves is well known in the art, and thus the instant electromagnetic shielding properties would have been inherent or obvious in the article of Smalley et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae H. Yoon whose telephone number is (571) 272-1128. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Tae H Yoon
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1714

THY/June 15, 2006